UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,561	07/31/2006	Lars Pettersson	15665-009US1 PD53655US02	8928

26191 7590 04/28/2009
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
BADIO, BARBARA P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1612	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/28/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/587,561	PETTERSSON, LARS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Barbara P. Badio	1612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 11-21* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *10* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/8/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

First Office Action on the Merits

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims recite a "use" without setting forth any steps involved in the process and, thus, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim that is not a proper process claim under 35 USC § 101 (see MPEP § 2173.05(q)).

Double Patenting

3. Claim 12 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Note: The recitation that the claimed compounds are for use as medicaments does not limit the scope of the claimed compounds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 13-15 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Among these factors are (1) the nature of the invention, (2) the breadth of the claims, (3) the state of the prior art, (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, (5) the amount of guidance or direction presented, (6) the presence or absence of working examples, (7) the relative skill in the art and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. When the above factors are taken into consideration, the examiner's position is that one skilled in the art could not perform the invention commensurate in scope with the instant claim without undue experimentation.

The instant claims are drawn to a method of treating estrogen related disorders or conditions that benefit from antiestrogen treatment by administering the claimed compounds. The present specification provides support by showing the in vitro binding

affinity to estrogen receptor-α and the in vivo estrogenic agonism/antagonism activity (see Biological models, pages 64-65).

The state of the pharmaceutical art is such that screening in vitro and in vivo is utilized to determine the desired effect of pharmaceuticals. There is no absolute predictability of pharmaceuticals and, thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not accept any therapeutic regimen on its face.

Because the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, it requires each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F 2d. 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is the more specific enablement is needed in order to satisfy the statute.

Here, the instantly claimed invention is highly unpredictable because of the complexity of the human body and the differences in the underlining cause(s) of the vast array of conditions encompassed by the instant invention (see for example, claims 14 and 20). In addition, there is a lack of showing in the medical art of the utilization of a single agent in the treatment of all of the disorders encompassed by the claimed invention. Even in the treatment of estrogen dependent cancers, the art teaches some antiestrogens, for example, tamoxifen, are useful in treating breast cancer but increases the incidence of endometrial cancer (references will be provided upon request).

Therefore, in the absence of a showing of correlation between all conditions/disorders encompassed by the instant claims and the effectiveness of the claimed compounds in treating said conditions/disorders, one of skill in the art would be

unable to fully predict the effect of administration of the claimed compounds in the treatment of conditions/disorders as encompassed by the instant claims.

As stated above, the only guidance given in the present specification is directed to the in vitro binding affinity to estrogen receptor-α and the in vivo estrogenic agonism and antagonism activity (see Biological models, pages 64-65), which is minimal. Thus, in order to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the instant claims, the skilled artisan would have to engage in undue experimentation to determine the conditions/disorders treatable by the claimed compounds, with no assurance of success.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-9 and 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The instant claims are indefinite for the following reasons:

Claims 1, 6, 11, 17 and 20 recite the term "comprising" in the definition of Markush groups. The use of said term instead of "consisting of" in a Markush claim creates confusion as the scope of the claimed invention. Applicant's attention is directed to MPEP § 2173.05(h).

Claim 8 lacks a period at the end of the claims and, thus, the metes and bound of the instant claim is unclear.

Claims 13-15 are indefinite because they merely recite a "use" without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced and, thus, it is unclear what process is encompassed by the claimed invention (see MPEP § 2173.05(q)).

Claims 13 and 19 recite treatment of "estrogen related disorder or condition that benefit from antiestrogen treatment" and "estrogen dependent disorder or condition" without identification of the said disorder/condition. Therefore, it is unclear what is encompassed by the above-mentioned phrases.

Claim Objections

8. Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Telephone Inquiry

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara P. Badio whose telephone number is 571-272-0609. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on 571-272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Barbara P. Badio/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612